UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,121	12/29/2000	Julio Estrada	LOT9-2000-0023 US1	8745

7590   02/07/2006

Stephen T. Keohane, Esq.
Lotus Development Corporation
55 Cambridge Parkway
Cambridge, MA 27085

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/752,121	ESTRADA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 October 2005_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,5-12 and 14-19_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _2-4 and 13_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,5-12 and 14-19_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _03 October 2001_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/26/2005 has been entered.

2.   The original priority date is **12/29/2000**.

3.   Claims 1, 5-12, and 14-19 remain pending.

4.   Claims 2-4, and 13 have been cancelled by the Applicant.

5.   Claims 1, 14-16, and 19 are the independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Dependent Claim 10, which depends on independent Claim 1, recites the limitation "responsive to creation of a valid link ...". Claim 1 recites "creating a form .. and hyperlinks that point to web pages". The valid link recited in Claim 10 appears disjointed from that of Claim 1 creating hyperlinks, since in Claim 1 the hyperlinks are to web pages while in Claim 10 the links (hyperlinks ?) appear to point to images within an html (web) page. The relationship between these claims is confusing making their interpretation unclear.

Similarly, the relationship between dependent Claim 12 and independent Claim 11 appears to be disjointed. Claim 12 recites, "downloading said html and linked images". However, Claim 11 from which claim 12 depends makes no mention of "said linked images", in fact it makes no mention of images at all. There appears to be a lack of antecedent basis in Claim 12 with respect to linked images.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 1, 11, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bialic (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,6856, filed 11/01/1999, issued

12/16/2003) in view of Salas et al. (hereinafter Salas, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,600 filed

07/15/1997, issued 05/14/2001)

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 14-19),

Bialic teaches *creating a form containing fields defining said schema and hyperlinks that*

point to web pages with the creation of a Web based form (step 1050) (with some form

of editor). Based on the form information, the Web based form is configured for use with

the database (step 1060). For example, elements of the Web based form ("Web form

elements") may be created that correspond to elements of the form used in the desktop

database application ("desktop form elements"), and associations between the Web

form elements and fields or records of the database may be created corresponding to

associations, as indicated in the form information, between the desktop form elements

and the fields or records (Col. 3, lines 34-40; Fig. 4). To summarize, Bialic's invention

allows a user to create a web form containing elements (*input fields*, buttons, menus,

etc.) that relate to an existing database (and hence *relate to the schema or design of*

the database). The web-based form is created to be eventually made part of a web

server offered up to users via a web browser for inputting or otherwise accessing a

database.

Bialic does not explicitly discuss that the HTML page containing an HTML form

contains *hyperlinks to web pages*, though one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention would have found the inclusion of hyperlinks to a web page to have been

obvious as it would have been common to produce HTML pages that contained

hyperlinks which provided navigational assistance to other parts of the page, or to other

pages within a web site, or to other web sites.

Bialic also implies that *the form is saved to local storage at said browser* in that

the creation of the form is performed from within a desktop application that is normally

used to interact with the database (see Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to conclude

that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have desired to at least

periodically store their form/web application to local storage to prevent both a loss of

their work and to allow for revision and update of the form without relying on a server's

version of the form.

While Bialic does not explicitly teach *dragging and dropping said form from local

storage into an upload control panel in a user interface to said collaboration space*, it is

apparent from the steps of Fig. 4 that the resulting web application (containing the form)

is transferred to a web server from a client via a network (see steps 1080, 1090). It is

noted that dragging and dropping was a well known means for easily moving files

(information) from one place to another within a windowing environment and it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume
that one would typically use a drag and drop technique to assist in uploading the web
application (containing the form) to a web server.

It is further noted that Bialic does not mention that the *server is, or contains a
collaboration space*. However, a web site (or web server) would have been considered
an obvious example of a collaboration space to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time
of invention in this instance as a plurality of users would have used the web application
(including the form) to interact with the database, providing the benefit of a more readily
accessible and common user interface.

However, Salas further teaches such a technique in uploading a form to a
collaboration site from a client (Col. 13, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to combine the teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to
uploading content to server environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows the user
an easy means to upload files to a server; saving time in the process.

Bialic continues by teaching *parsing said form to identify said fields and
incorporate them into said schema* in that a text file version of a desktop database form
file is produced, and the text file version is parsed to derive database interaction
information. Results of the parsing include a virtual directory at the Web server that
includes one or more text files known as "ini files" and one or more files for Web forms.
Such an ini file includes information such as table relationship information and database

connection information that is needed in the new Web application to display and search

database data (Abstract).

Bialic also teaches *integrating said form into said collaboration space; rendering*

said form to a user; and receiving said form from said user with new data content for

said collaboration space (see Fig. 4; steps describing that the web server is readied to

accept the web application containing the form for interaction with the database). In use,

the now web application can be selected by a user who accesses the web server to

interact with the database (see Fig. 19, steps 2090, 2100, 2110).

In regard to independent Claim 11, Claim 11 reflects the method for integrating

forms including fields defining the schema of a collaboration space into said

collaboration space, as claimed in Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 14-19), and is rejected

along the same rationale.

In addition, Bialic teaches that the forms are in HTML (Col. 4, lines 1-6). Also,

Bialic teaches *rendering said form in edit mode to a user; and receiving said form from*

said user with new data content for said collaboration space in that when others place

the web application on the web server for use, the form is made available to have its

fields filled in (*an edit mode*) by the user of the database for accessing the database, or

perhaps inputting information into the database (see Fig. 16). That form is subsequently

processed by the server (*a read mode*) and the database is accessed.

11.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialic in

view of Salas, and in further view of Hanson et al. (hereinafter Hanson, U.S. Patent No.

5,956,736 filed 09/27/1996 issued 09/21/1999).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, neither Bialic nor Salas explicitly *teach parsing*

said form, finding linked files and processing uniform resource locators to generate a

form object; saving to a page object said form, said linked files, and said form object;

and displaying at said browser said page with said form object in read mode and said

form in edit mode. However, Hanson teaches an object comprising a web document

being executed by a server, having been previously uploaded to the server from an

object-oriented web editor client, and subsequently requested by a client for display

(Col. 13, lines 48-57). So, the object (web page) was created by an editor and uploaded

to the server as an object. The web page (object) consists of other objects (each HTML

tag, for example). So, the web object (form) is executed (involving parsing) and tags are

converted to whatever formats the client requests (e.g., client can request an HTML

page, or other characteristics of the object) via handlers. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic,

Salas and Hanson as all three inventions relate to the creation of html documents.

Hanson adds the benefit of further defining each component of a web page (such as

form input fields) in the form of objects whose attributes can be manipulated.

12.   Claims 10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bialic in view of Salas, and in further view of Kagle (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,153 filed

04/27/1999 issued 08/17/2004).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Bialic fails to teach that *responsive to*

creation of a valid link to an image within an html page or skin, creating a uniform

resource locator (url) by: downloading said images into a local directory in the same

folder as said html page or skin. However, Salas teaches that file download and

subsequent upload, if necessary, is managed by a background daemon. Alternatively, a

separately executing program may manage file upload and download; the only

requirement is that the file upload/download application executes separately from the

browser application, so that premature exiting of the browser program is handled

appropriately by upload/download code (Col. 12, lines 15-22). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to collaborative work

environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows for uploading/downloading server

workspaces to maintain local versions.

Bialic fails to teach *uploading said linked and download images from said local*

directory automatically when said page or skin is uploaded. However, Kagle teaches

that pictorial/image information can be entered as a pointer to a locally stored image,

which is uploaded with the completed page layout (Col. 6, lines 53-60). Here, a PDA

uploads a page layout and an image referred to in the page layout. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Bialic, Salas and Kagle as all both inventions relate to the creation of web

pages. The benefit of Kagle's teaching is to allow for more efficient uploading by

uploading all components of a web site in the same upload session.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 contains subject matter similar to

that found in Claim 10, and is rejected along similar lines of reasoning.

In addition, Bialic fails to teach *importing an original html file, which contains an*

image tag, and the related image files into collaboration space. However, Salas teaches

that file uploading may be done in the background or in the foreground. If done in the

foreground the user will be blocked from further work on that file until the

upload/download is complete. Once the upload is complete, the server 14 updates

metadata stored in its database 20 that is associated with the file, for example, any edit

lock set by the editing user is released (Col. 132, lines 60-67). Also, once the user is

finished editing the file, it may be uploaded to the server 14 to allow other users access

to it. The user signals that the file should be transmitted to the server 14 by *dragging the*

file onto an eRoom displayed by the browser (step 704). *Dropping the file into the*

displayed eRoom invokes an ActiveX control or a background daemon process, which

manages the upload of the file to the server 14 (Col. 13, lines 19-26). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to collaborative work

environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows for creating/updating server

workspaces without interfering with other collaborators.

Salas fails to teach *parsing said original html file to find linked images; creating a modified html file by modifying said image tag in said html file to refer to the copy of the image file attached to document on the server; saving said original html file and said modified html file on a collaboration space page object*. However, Kagle teaches in Fig. 8 a process whereby template files are created on a client computer (a PDA in this case). Template files and any images, audio, etc. that are referenced in the template files are uploaded to a server. The server processes the templates and builds an html page (see Fig. 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic, Salas, and Kagle as all three inventions relate to the creation of web pages. The benefit of Kagle's teaching is to allow for more efficient uploading by uploading all components of a web site in the same upload session.

Response to Arguments

13.   The Applicant argues with respect to Claims 1-6, 11, and 13-19 that the prior art of Cannata, Salas as well as Kagle and Hanson fail to teach all of the limitations. The Examiner agrees and withdraws the rejection. However, a new rejection is made with respect to the prior art of Bialic in combination with Salas, Kagle and Hanson to teach the deficiencies in the previous rejections.

Bialic teaches the creation of web forms basing fields on the schema of a database, then offering the form to a web site so that others may access and use the form for interactions with the database.

Conclusion

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
01/25/2006

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100